Remarks

Applicant respectfully requests that this Amendment After Final Action be admitted under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116.

Applicant submits that this Amendment presents claims in better form for consideration on appeal. Furthermore, applicant believes that consideration of this Amendment could lead to favorable action that would remove one or more issues for appeal.

Claims 1 and 14 have been amended. No claims have been canceled. Therefore, claims 1-20 are now presented for examination.

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Blatter et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,016,348). Applicant submits that the present claims are patentable over Blatter.

Blatter discloses a decoder conditional access system that incorporates different encryption systems for providing access to programs derived from different sources. A conditional access processor for processing encrypted program data and an associated encryption code includes a first algorithm means for decrypting the encryption code to provide an encryption key. The conditional access processor also includes a second algorithm means for encrypting the encryption key and the second encryption algorithm is different to the first encryption algorithm. A datastream representing the program is generated from encrypted program data and an associated encryption code. The encryption code is decrypted to provide an encryption key using a first algorithm. The encryption key is encrypted using a second algorithm different to the first encryption algorithm and the program datastream is formed from the encrypted program data and the encrypted encryption key. The program datastream is decrypted by selecting between a

first and a second decryption algorithm and by decrypting the encryption code to provide

an encryption key. The encryption key is used to decrypt the encrypted program. A

storage medium data format for recording encrypted program data is also disclosed. See

Blatter at Abstract.

Claim 1 of the present application recites:

> A method comprising:
> receiving video data at an application program;
> transmitting the video data to one or more memory buffers;
> decrypting the video data; and
> <u>monitoring a page table entry bit corresponding to each of the one or more memory buffers to determine whether a second application program has accessed the one or more memory buffers.</u>

Applicant submits that Blatter does not disclose a process of monitoring a page

table entry corresponding to a memory buffers to determine whether a second application

program has accessed the memory buffer. However, the Examiner asserts that "Blatter

clearly disclosed such use of memory device page table entries (e.g., a look-up table, col.

4 (line 65) to col. 5(line 6))." See Final Office Action at page 3, paragraph 11.

The passage relied on by the Examiner discloses:

> The pre-loaded PIDs are used in units 47 and 45 to identify the data packets that are to be stored and the data packets that are to be decoded for use in providing a video image. The pre-loaded PIDs are stored in look-up tables in units 45 and 47. The PID look-up tables are memory mapped to encryption key tables in units 45 and 47 that associate encryption keys with each pre-loaded PID. The memory mapped PID and encryption key look-up tables permit units 45 and 47 to match encrypted packets containing a pre-loaded PID with associated encryption keys that permit their decryption. Non-encrypted packets do not have associated encryption keys.

Blatter at col. 4 (line 65) to col. 5(line 6)).

Applicant submits that nowhere in the passage of Blatter relied on by the Examiner is there disclosed or suggested a process of monitoring a page table entry corresponding to a memory buffers to determine whether a second application program has accessed the memory buffer. Instead, the passage includes a description of how look-up tables are memory mapped to encryption key tables that associate encryption keys with pre-loaded PIDs. Thus, the Examiner's construal of Blatter does not suggest monitoring a page table entry to determine whether a second application program has accessed a memory buffer. As a result, claim 1 is patentable over Blatter.

Claims 2-8 depend from claim 1 and include additional features. Thus, claims 2-8 are also patentable over Blatter.

Claim 9 recites:

> A computer system comprising:
> an application to receive data content;
> a memory device to store the data content;
> a decoder to decode the content; and
> <u>a decryption module to decrypt the data content, and to monitor access to the memory device to determine if memory buffers storing the data content have been accessed by a second application prior to the decoding of the data content.</u>

For the reasons described above with respect to claim 1, claim 9 is patentable over Blatter. Because claims 10-13 depend from claim 9 and include additional features, claims 10-13 are also patentable over Blatter.

Claim 14 recites:
> An article of manufacture including one or more computer readable media that embody a program of instructions, wherein the program of instructions, when executed by a processing unit, causes the processing unit to:

receive video data at an application program;
transmit the video data to one or more memory
buffers
decrypt the video data; and
<u>monitor a page table entry bit corresponding to each</u>
<u>of the one or more memory buffers to determine</u>
<u>whether a second application program has accessed the</u>
<u>one or more memory buffers</u>.

Thus, for the reasons described above with respect to claim 1, claim 14 is patentable over

Blatter. Because claims 15-20 depend from claim 14 and include additional features,

claims 15-20 are also patentable over Blatter.

Applicant submits that the rejections have been overcome, and that the claims are

in condition for allowance. Accordingly, applicant requests the rejections be withdrawn

and the claims be allowed.

The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at (303) 740-1980 if there

remains any issue with allowance of the case.

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: <u>December 7, 2005</u>

Mark I. Watson
Reg. No. 46,322

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
7th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026
(303) 740-1980